

### **REMARKS**

/ The Examiner's indication of allowability of claim 28, if rewritten in independent form, is acknowledged and appreciated.

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a). The Office Action states that "all features in claims 26-29 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s)." The Office Action, however, does not state which features of claims 26-29 are not shown in the drawings. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner identify the features of the claims that he believes are missing from the drawings, or withdraw the objection.

Claims 26-27 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Choi et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, because the cited reference does not disclose (or suggest) the claimed body portion of a mask including a first flat surface and a second surface on the opposite side of the body portion. The reference also does not disclose or suggest the claimed third and fourth oblique surfaces arranged on either side of the second vertical plane, in addition to the first and second oblique surfaces which are arranged on either side of the first vertical plane.

In the Office Action, a polarizer 10 and a mask 80 of Choi et al. are combined to equate with the claimed mask. The polarizer 10 is then separately identified as the claimed body portion. Further, the first flat surface is asserted to be on the rear surface of mask 80 and the second surface on the front surface of the polarizer 10.

As clearly shown in Fig. 5A of the reference, the polarizer 10 and the mask 80 are spaced with respect to each other. Therefore, the first and second surfaces of Choi et al. cannot disclose (or suggest) the claimed first and second surfaces which are on the opposite side of the same body portion of the mask. For at least this reason, claim 26 and its dependent claims 27-29 are believed to be allowable.

Moreover, the reference also does not disclose (or suggest) the third and fourth oblique surfaces arranged on either side of a second vertical plane, which is perpendicular to a first vertical plane. The Office Action states that the first and second oblique surfaces are disclosed in Choi et al. by the quartz substrates 15 that are arranged on either side of a vertical plane 13 on the polarizer 10. Even assuming that the quartz substrate 15 can be interpreted to disclose the claimed first and second surfaces, the polarizer 10 in Fig. 4B of Choi et al. clearly does not disclose the third and fourth oblique surfaces arranged on either side of a second vertical plane, which is perpendicular to the first vertical plane. Fig. 4B only shows the quartz substrates 15 which are all aligned in two directions diverging from the polarizer holder 13. Fig. 4B does not show third and fourth oblique surfaces which diverge in two other directions, as described in claim 26.


In Choi et al., the light goes into the polarizer 10, and is then only reflected or transmitted as shown in Fig. 3A. In contrast, the light goes into the flat upper surface of the body portion of the mask, is separated into each direction in each of the oblique surfaces and then goes into the alignment layer, in the present invention (see Figs. 14 and 16). Four

domains having different alignment from each other are generated in total. Therefore, even if a user sees the display at a large viewing angle from every direction, he can see the display quite favorably.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. The Examiner should contact Applicants' undersigned attorney if a telephone conference would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By   
B. Joe Kim  
Registration No. 41,895

March 17, 2008

300 South Wacker Drive, Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312.360.0080  
Facsimile: 312.360.9315  
Customer Number 24978

P:\DOCS\4319\69735\CO5266.DOC